

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 18, 21-22, 29 and 45 have been amended. The claim amendments should in no way be construed to be acquiescence to any rejection based on alleged prior art. The amendments to the claims are made solely to expedite the prosecution of the application by clarifying characteristics of certain claim limitations. Accordingly, none of the claim amendments narrow the claims as originally presented. Applicant reserves the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or subsequent patent applications.

Rejection of Claims 45-48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 45-48 stand rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant's attorney respectfully traverses this rejection. A claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See MPEP 2106.01 and *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035. As such, claims 45-48 are directed to statutory subject matter.

Moreover, the Examiner suggests amending the claims to include the element "displaying the message" in order to demonstrate a useful and tangible result, inasmuch as such a result would be discernible to a human user. However, the Applicant's attorney respectfully submits that because the result of the claimed mobile-object functionality is a better-informed electronic system (collection host platform) ultimately serving human needs, such result is clearly useful and tangible. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 1-14, 16-34 and 36-48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being
Anticipated By Lewis**

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites filtering received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in an event source platform, the mobile agent object operable to execute in a first electronic device, halt execution in the first electronic device at an execution state, be transplanted to a second electronic device, and resume execution from the execution state in the second electronic device.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIG. 4 and paragraphs 38-41, mobile agent objects work together to filter and collect messages at event source platforms 220 and 230 which meet a particular requirement of a user. The requirements are encoded as the event triggers and message properties contained within the mobile agent objects from configuration. Once determined to be relevant, *e.g.*, filtered, messages are sent to a collection host platform 210 and stored in a message database 211 for later retrieval by a redirection method described elsewhere in the specification.

As discussed in a previously filed paper, Lewis fails in any manner to teach or suggest filtering received message objects with a mobile agent object executing therein. As also previously discussed, Lewis fails to even discuss or otherwise mention mobile agent objects having the claimed functionality. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45, as amended, are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-14, 16-17, 19-20, 23-28, 30-34, 36-44 and 46-48

Claims 2-14, 16-17, 19-20, 23-28, 30-34, 36-44 and 46-48 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45.

**Rejection of Claim 35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Lewis**

Claim 35 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 29.

**Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Lewis In View of Irlam**

Irlam fails to supply the teachings missing from Lewis, namely filtering received message objects with a mobile agent object. As such Lewis and Irlam, taken each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Office Action rejecting any claim.**

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



P. G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491